

**Murray History Advisory Board
Minutes for Monday, July 18, 2011**

Attendance: Susan Wright, Jay Bollwinkel, David Adams, Peter Steele, Mary Ann Kirk (staff)

Excused: Ian Wright

1. Minutes for June 28, 2011 were approved as written.
2. Demolition request for 4759 S State was discussed. The building and the area was removed from the DHOD. However it is a contributing building in our national register business district and therefore remains on our local register. This designation was discussed and reconfirmed at a previous meeting in 2010. The contractor has provided photos of the building. We can't find any original photo of the building from county tax records. We have good written history about the original owners. Board members did not feel any further documentation was necessary and approved the demolition request by a unanimous vote. Per normal policy, we will ask the contractor to watch for any hidden historical items that might be found in the demolition process. Susan was interested in the exterior gingerbread features. Mary Ann will ask the contractor to call her.
3. The Olympus Ranch Retirement Center was interested in cosponsoring a history event at their location. Their intent is to expose the community to their services. Board members agreed that we could provide access to our photos. However they should host an event on their own using historic photos, but it didn't make sense to host a "city event" there.
4. Board members liked the idea of hosting the grand opening of the water exhibit in the museum for Museum Day in September rather than a bus tour to other museums in the county. Jay thought a hands-on water demonstration featuring a small model of water ditches and gates would be doable. You could use a water feature with a pump that recirculates the water. Mary Ann thought maybe it could be an eagle scout project.
5. Cottonwood Street study has identified two different traffic options for historic downtown Murray. The preferred alternative involves 4 demolitions and the other alternative involves 6 demolitions. Peter reviewed some of project impacts. Susan noted that one of the projects took out her parking lot and garden. Peter said they are having a public meeting where she could answer these questions or she could go on-line and look at the map. Mary Ann provided several mitigation options and asked for input to determine our preferred mitigation for the historic impact which is required with this project. The impact is fairly small but Peter said there is some money leftover from the project that could be used for mitigation projects.
 1. Basic documentation of proposed demolition plus 4-6 additional buildings
 2. ILS surveys for 6-10 buildings identified as most significant in area.
 3. Document history of neighborhood - Hanuaer, Box Elder, Poplar, 4th/5th Ave.

4. Feasibility study of Harker/Murray Merc.

Board members agreed we should assume basic documentation of all demolished buildings will occur automatically. None of these have major historical and architectural significance as far as we can tell. Mary Ann said this could be done later when the project actually begins. However, some of this mitigation could possibly occur now.

After discussion, board members recommended the following:

First Preference:

Document the development and general history of the neighborhood (Hanauer, Box Elder, Regal, Miller, Poplar, 4th and 5th Avenue) including a basic summary of the types of architectural styles and description of the people who lived there (possibly some oral histories). If money is available, place signage with some of this basic neighborhood information near the Cahoon Mansion in anticipation of a historic park there.

Second Preference:

Feasibility study of Harker/Murray Mercantile buildings to assist the City in encouraging adaptive reuse of these buildings in the new downtown plan.

Board members also discussed the idea of doing 4-10 ILS surveys of the most significant buildings in the area aside from the potential demolitions, but felt the above projects would be more beneficial. This could still be discussed if the preferences are not acceptable to the various parties who must sign off on the mitigation.